



## Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant (ABTP) Neighbourhood Liaison Committee (Meeting #92)

Toronto Fire Academy, 895 Eastern Avenue  
Thursday, February 12, 2009  
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

### Attendance:

Karey Shinn	NLC Co-Chair; Safe Sewage Committee
Karen Buck	Citizens for a Safe Environment; NLC Co-Chair
David Done	Beaches Resident; Safe Sewage Committee
Bob Kortright	Resident; Toronto Field Naturalists
Jim Neff	Citizens for a Safe Environment
Michael Rosenberg	Economics of Technology Working Group
Steven Whyte	ICMC; Resident of South Riverdale

### City of Toronto:

Shabbir Dattoo	ABTP Engineer, Toronto Water
Mike Logan	Public Consultation Unit (note-taker)

### Other:

Jason Diceman	LURA Consulting
Sally Leppard	LURA Consulting

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

**Karey Shinn** brought the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

**Karey** added “Master Plan” to the list of mini-updates (Agenda Item #5) and noted that there is a request for an additional agenda item from **Hy Schwartz**; he is not here but we will consider that item if he arrives. The agenda was approved with this contingency.

## 2. Review and Approval of ABTP NLC Minutes

- **Meeting #91, November 6, 2008**

**Karen Buck** indicated that the name “Harbour Remediation and Transfer” should be capitalized throughout page 3. **Karen** suggested rewording in the second paragraph under the discussion of Action Item #88/7 to better explain the function of the Harbour Remediation and Transfer committee. **Karen** further clarified her comments under Action Item #90/1. **Karen** submitted these changes and further minor changes to grammar in writing at the meeting.

All agreed on these changes.

**Michael Rosenberg** questioned whether Action Item #89/5 should really be marked as “completed.” He

explained that he felt the action item was not really completed, because the answer received from staff did not adequately satisfy the request for information. **Shabbir Dattoo** assured the NLC that he had forwarded the action item exactly as it appears in the minutes and received the response back exactly as it appears in the minutes. **Michael** reiterated that a satisfactory answer had not been received, so the request for information should be made again. The NLC agreed to clarify and resubmit the request.

Action Item #1: **Shabbir Dattoo** to find out if the Veolia Contract contains an expiration date should the pelletizer not be commissioned, and to obtain this answer as a “Yes” or “No”.

**Stephen Whyte** clarified the point he made as described in the thirteenth paragraph under the ICMC Steering Committee minutes of the same date. The changes were noted, but are not part of the NLC minutes.

The minutes were adopted as amended.

### 3. Input into C&C plan for ABTP Approved EA Undertaking

**Sally Leppard** introduced herself and LURA Consulting as responsible for creating and implementing the Communications and Consultation (C&C) plan for the ABTP Approved EA Undertakings. She reviewed the content of the Approved EA Undertakings (disinfection system, outfall and pumping station). These are the works that the public will be consulted on through the C&C plan. Sally explained that she will create a draft C&C plan based on ideas submitted by both the Implementation and Compliance Monitoring Committee (ICMC) and the NLC as well as the overall project schedule supplied by the City and technical consultants (AECOM).

The purpose of tonight’s session is to get input from the NLC to add to the input already supplied by the ICMC. Two questions were posed to the group:

1. Which approaches to consultation and communication do you think should be used in this project?
2. How does the NLC want to be involved or used in the consultation and communications processes?

The Neighbourhood Liaison Committee provided the following suggestions for the planning of the project’s public communications and consultation:

- The plan needs to take its direction based on the 1999 Mediation Agreement.
- Provide stakeholders with information prior to a meeting.
- The communication of technical information needs to be presented in an accessible manner for laypersons.
- Complete detailed documentation should also be made available, not just simplified versions.
- Visual presentation is better than auditory.
- Present information in different types of formats, e.g. Frequently Asked Questions.
- In meetings use small group tables to discuss aspects of the project.
- Be strategic in the selection of where and when meetings are held.
- Publish notices in the paper and use flyers.
- Conduct workshops and open houses on specific rather than broad issues.
- Invite stakeholders to get more involved in the planning of the project.
- Workshops are preferred to open houses.

- Don't want just open house, where there is no plenary meeting. There needs to be opportunity for getting a sense of consensus in the room.
- You could use dot sticker voting, e.g. red, blue, and green stickers.
- Plant tours would be nice, but not likely.
- When using slides, they need to be presented slowly.
- There is a preference for plenary meeting formats with technical support to answer questions.
- Staff responses to public questions and input should be in writing, i.e. not devolve into an informal conversation.
- Minutes at meetings should accurately reflect who said what.
- Ministry of Environment staff needs to be present and involved.
- Publish a backgrounder booklet/newsletter, including the project rationale, the key players, project, history, reasoning, benefits, etc.
- NLC could act as a liaison committee during construction to inform neighbourhood organizations.
- The ICMC should receive a copy of the project proposal to understand how the project is being conducted.
- Use communication opportunities to get more public support for environmental and infrastructure projects.
- There is a large segment of the public that are concerned but not in attendance at meetings.
- Use other forms of communication beyond meetings, e.g. online.
- Public response forms response rates are usually low.
- NLC could host a public meeting.
- The Disinfection Study is the key interest, compared to outflow and pumping.
- In public communication materials, there needs to be references and to the sources of facts and statements e.g. bibliography and footnotes.
- The substance of the study is more important than the communication methods. The goal is to improve air and water quality.
- It is important how consultation is timed to actual decisions so that public input can be considered and have an effect on decisions.

**Karey Shinn** stated that she would like to receive some information about the Approved EA Undertaking so that she can 'match it up' with the Mediation Agreement.

#### **4. Review of NLC Action Items & Motions**

Meeting #86: Action Item #3

*Robert Davis to look into establishing a process for tracking motions.*

**Mike Logan** explained the memorandum that was distributed with the meeting package. This memo explains the City's position; the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the NLC does not recognize action items or motions, and therefore the City is not obligated to respond to them. Rather, the NLC is one of the vehicles for communication between the local community and the City with respect to issues with the ABTP that have a direct impact on the

local neighbourhood. The memo explains the city's position and as an act of good faith, is committing staff to respond to reasonable requests made by the NLC as soon as possible.

**Stephen Whyte** noted that the NLC's ToR indicate that the committee can manage our actions in any way the committee sees fit. **Mike Logan** agreed.

**Michael Rosenberg** explained that the original action item (#86.3) was a friendly request for some help in getting responses to questions. The NLC felt that the Public Consultation Unit (PCU) could help get councillors to deal with motions. In the past, when the NLC has tried to get someone to do something, we never know what happens.

**Jim Neff** proposed a "friendly amendment" to the memorandum that would clarify that the issues within the purview of the NLC include but are not limited to those listed. Further, feedback would be provided as soon as possible and no longer than six months after requests are made. **Mike Logan** explained that he was not prepared to make 'amendments' to the memo, as it is not an official document, but would be happy to note in the minutes that the intent is to provide feedback to the NLC as soon as possible. Likewise, he was happy to note that any issue not listed in the memo which has a direct impact on the community is also within the purview of the NLC.

**Michael Rosenberg** suggested that the memo just reiterated and clarified the City's current process for reporting to the NLC rather than improved the reporting situation. **Karen Buck** agreed that the message is that the PCU is not prepared to follow up on motions with Councillors and staff. She suggested that different terminology for action items and motions may be appropriate in light of this memo.

#### Disposition: Completed

Review of other action items deferred due to time constraints.

## 5. Mini-updates

- **Odour Control Project**

**Shabbir Dattoo** indicated that the Odour Control project is progressing. The M&T Building Tender is closing on February 11, 2009. Construction should begin in the spring of 2009. D Building is in the detailed design phase; tendering is scheduled for summer 2009 and construction should start in the fourth quarter of 2009. Aeration tank ducting to the main stack is also in the detailed design phase; tendering is scheduled for summer 2009 and construction for the third quarter of 2009.

The P Building re-design contract was approved by the Bid Committee at the end January 2009. Design should commence this month with an estimated timeline of 2.5 years. Aeration tank upgrades will be done in stages, using three separate tenders, with the first scheduled for the first quarter of 2010 (subject to budget approval). Work on the truck loading facility is scheduled for tendering in the third quarter of 2014.

- **EA**

**Shabbir Dattoo** reported that AECOM are now on board as the technical consultants and are working on the disinfection study. They will be making a presentation to the ICMC on their workplan at their March 12 meeting.

Preceding session with Sally Leppard accepted as an update on the Approved EA Undertakings.

- **Landscaping Plan**

**Shabbir Dattoo** informed the NLC that both the Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments are

complete. The documentation is still in draft form, so it is not available to the public. Over the next six to eight weeks, the consultants will be conducting a Contaminant-Receptor Pathway Analysis (CRPA).

**Mike Logan** added that the Pump House Park project team were looking forward to presenting their progress to the NLC at their meeting in May, once the CRPA study is completed. They will be interested in feedback on the preferred design from the NLC before they present the design to the public.

**Karey Shinn** suggested that Dalton Shipway and the rest of the NLC will be expecting the project team to explain how the CRPA methodology compares to other comparable studies (e.g. Hydro site).

**Jim Neff** added that the skateboard park is already being put to good use by people who enter the site while the contractors are not around.

- **Pelletizer**

**Shabbir Dattoo** reported that the pelletizer facility failed the secondary (66-day) performance test because it was not able to process the volume of pellets intended. The City is currently in negotiations with Veolia on how to resolve outstanding issues and deficiencies. In the interim, the facility is being restarted for further testing.

**David Done** asked what the cause of the failure was. **Shabbir Dattoo** explained that the issue was the quantity of pellets produced did not meet the requirements of the 66-day test.

**Michael Rosenberg** asked when the 66-day test was stopped. **Shabbir Dattoo** said that he did not know exactly, but it was near the end of December. The test was stopped towards the end of the 66-day test period when it was clear that the time left would not be sufficient to achieve the quantity required. Maintenance on the pelletizer was undertaken in early January and production was restarted this week.

**Stephen Whyte** asked if the pelletizer continues to fail and the City needs to build a different one, would a new Certificate of Authorization (CofA) be required? **Shabbir Dattoo** said that he did not know, but would presume that either a new CofA or a change to the existing one would be required. **Karen Buck** indicated that a report had been presented to the Public Works & Infrastructure Committee on the pelletizer. **Mike Logan** said that he would append that report to the minutes of this meeting.

- **Biosolids Master Plan (BMP)**

Several members of the NLC attended a public meeting on the BMP on February 11, 2009.

**David Done** said that he was concerned by the fact that the City had not identified what their preferred methods of managing biosolids are. **Mike Logan** explained that the current public consultation is gathering feedback from the public on a) what the preferred methods of management should be, and b) the scoring system for ultimately determining the preferred methods. **David** pointed out that the City already had identified preferred methods in the Draft BMP. **Mike** stated that based on feedback from the ICMC, the Draft BMP underwent a peer review and is now being updated based on that peer review, so the preferred methods are being re-evaluated. **David** asked when the preferred management methods would be chosen. **Mike** said that the preferred methods will be determined based on public feedback, and presented in about three months. A further round of public consultation will be held in June to gather feedback on the preferred management methods. **Karen Buck** reminded the NLC it was important to provide comments.

Further information can be found online at [www.toronto.ca/biosolids\\_masterplan](http://www.toronto.ca/biosolids_masterplan)  
Comments can be e-mailed to [biosolids@toronto.ca](mailto:biosolids@toronto.ca)

## 6. Odour Control Protocol and Tracking

**Karey Shinn** suggested that there was not sufficient time to discuss the Odour Protocol. She pointed out that a copy of a memo from the City to the NLC dated October 3, 2002 had been redistributed. This memo summarizes the draft odour control protocol that the NLC worked with the City on developing at the time. Karey encouraged NLC members to review this memo and be prepared to discuss the protocol at the next meeting.

Action Item #91.4 Disposition: Completed

**Shabbir Dattoo** said that this protocol was a draft, has not been approved and is not currently in use. He said that Plant staff were willing to work with the NLC to update the current protocol, but the NLC needs to remember that the plant now has several hundred fewer staff than it did a few years ago. As such, it may not be possible to implement all of the actions that NLC members would like. **Shabbir** added that every complaint currently received by the plant is followed up on. In fact, there are very few complaints (there has only been one since the last NLC meeting in November). It is also important to remember that a lot of money is being invested in odour control mechanisms at the plant and as a result, there should be far fewer odour problems in the future. NLC members should be mindful of these issues when considering updating the protocol.

**Karen Buck** suggested that there would be many more odour complaints in the summer than in the winter. She added that the staffing issue is also related to the new 311 service. She said that she read a newspaper article about the 311 service recently, and had little confidence in the service with regard to follow-up with the original caller that would confirm the source of the odour and the resultant action taken. It is her understanding that the current Toronto Water odour protocol does not include Staff involvement to confirm the source of the odour nor to take action nor to report back to the original caller.

**Mike Logan** distributed a memorandum he prepared about how 311 will handle odour complaints (in response to Action Item #91.2). He explained that 311 will make it easier for the public to contact the city, and will electronically track all calls to ensure that concerns are handled effectively and efficiently. 311 will not change the existing Toronto Water protocol for handling odour complaints; they will only pass on and track the calls.

The NLC agreed that this was acceptable and they would review the draft odour protocol from 2002 for the next meeting.

Action Item #91.2 Disposition: Completed

## 7. Next meeting & Adjournment

The next NLC meeting was tentatively scheduled for Thursday, May 7, 2009. The Mennonite New Life Centre was recommended as a better meeting location. The Pump House Park project team will present at this meeting. In addition, it was requested that the PCU bring copies of the ICMC's Annual Report to the meeting for distribution to NLC members.

**Shabbir Dattoo** requested the NLC members that if it was at all possible, they provide their comments on previous meeting minutes to PCU prior to the meeting date, so that these comments can be incorporated into the minutes, thereby maintaining the time period allotted to minute review and approval in the agenda.